





UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS Washington, D.C. 20231 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/740,708	12/19/2000	George D. Chandley	GM142	5022
7:	590 06/25/2002			
Mr. Edward J.		EXAMINER		
Walnut Woods 5955 W. Main		COMBS, JANELL A		
Kalamazoo, Ml	49009	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			1742	0
			DATE MAILED: 06/25/2002	8

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

7) - 4)			_	\	AS-		
		Applicati	n No.	Applicant(s)			
0.65	A - 4: O	09/740,7	08	CHANDLEY ET AL.			
Οπις Ι	Action Summary	Examine	r	Art Unit			
=	IO DATE AND		Combs-Morillo	1742	Idroop		
Th MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply							
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). - Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). Status							
1) Responsive	e to communication(s) filed	d on <u>12 April 2002</u>					
2a) This action	is FINAL . 2b	o) This action is	non-final.				
3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213. Disp sition of Claims							
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-24</u> is/are pending in the application.							
4a) Of the above claim(s) <u>1-9</u> is/are withdrawn from consideration.							
5) Claim(s)	is/are allowed.						
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>10</u>	-24 is/are rejected.						
7) Claim(s)	7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.						
, —	are subject to restriction	on and/or election i	equirement.				
Application Papers							
	ation is objected to by the I		1				
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) □ accepted or b) □ objected to by the Examiner.							
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). 11) The proposed drawing correction filed on is: a) approved b) disapproved by the Examiner.							
,	=			oved by the examin	ei.		
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.							
12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Pri rity under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120							
•		or foreign priority ()	nder 35 II S.C. & 119(a)-(d) or (f)			
13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of:							
•		ocuments have bee	an received				
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.							
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No.3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage							
`a	pplication from the Internal hed detailed Office action	tional Bureau (PCT	Rule 17.2(a)).		Clago		
14) Acknowledgn	nent is made of a claim for	domestic priority u	inder 35 U.S.C. § 119	e) (to a provisiona	I application).		
 a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received. 15)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121. 							
Attachment(s)							
	s Cited (PTO-892) on's Patent Drawing Review (PT0 re Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Pap		4) Interview Summa 5) Notice of Informal 6) Other:	• •			
C Detect and Trademark Office							

Application/Control Number: 09/740,708

Art Unit: 1742

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 2. Claims 10-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over WO 00/45973 (WO'973) in view of Nazmy et al (US 5,286,442 A).

WO'973 teaches a process of using a titanium aluminide machine components (such as hot sleeves, plungers, dies, extrusion dies, holders for filters in permanent mold casting, page 2 lines 12-16) or mixing blades (page 2 line 10) for contacting molten aluminum (page 2 lines 6-7). WO'973 teaches the use of a gamma phase Ti-Al alloy typically 30-35wt% Al and 55-65wt% Ti (page 6 lines 18-23). WO'973 teaches that said Ti-Al alloy machine component or mixer blade can be oxidized to provide a surface oxide film by heating to a temperature ≥ 800°F (≥427°C), followed by cooling in air (page 5 lines 22-34).

Concerning independent claims 10 and 21, WO'973 does not teach the use of a Ti-Al alloy including a rare earth element in an effective amount to prolong resistance to attack of the alloy by the molten material, as presently claimed. However, Nazmy teaches gamma phase Ti-Al alloys intended for machine components (abstract), and teaches that certain alloying additions (such as Yttrium) provide for excellent hardness and strength at high temperatures (column 15 lines 25-54, Exemplary embodiment 54 and 56), enabling the field of application of the modified Ti-Al alloys to be extended to temperatures between 600-1000°C (column 14 lines 52-54).

Application/Control Number: 09/740,708

Art Unit: 1742

Nazmy teaches example alloys 14 (50at% Ti, 2 at%Y, 48at% Al), 15 (49at% Ti, 3 at%Y, 48at% Al), 21 (48.5at% Ti, 3 at%Y, 48at% Al, 0.5at% B), and 23 (48.5at% Ti, 3 at%Y, 48at% Al, 0.5at% Ge) that fall with the scope of the instant claim, and Fig. 2 and Fig. 3 show that Yttrium provides for excellent hardness and strength at high temperatures. It would have been obvious to add Yttrium to the Ti-Al alloy taught by WO'973, because Nazmy teaches that adding a rare earth metal such as Yttrium to a gamma phase Ti-Al alloy provides for excellent hardness and strength at high temperatures (column 15 lines 25-54).

Concerning dependent claim 11, as stated above, WO'973 teaches the use of a gamma phase Ti-Al alloy.

Concerning dependent claim 12, and 22-24, as stated above, Nazmy teaches example alloy 14 (50at% Ti, 2 at%Y, 48at% Al is equivalent to 61.9wt%, 4.6wt% Y, 33.5wt% Al) which falls within the scope of the instant claim. It would have been obvious to add Yttrium to the Ti-Al alloy taught by WO'973, because Nazmy teaches that adding a rare earth metal such as Yttrium to a gamma phase Ti-Al alloy provides for excellent hardness and strength at high temperatures (column 15 lines 25-54).

Concerning dependent claims 13-15, WO'973 teaches the formation of a surface oxide, as stated above. WO'973 teaches that said Ti-Al alloy machine component or mixer blade can be oxidized to provide a surface oxide film by heating to a temperature $\geq 800^{\circ}F$ ($\geq 427^{\circ}C$), followed by cooling in air (page 5 lines 22-34).

Concerning independent claim 16, the examiner points out that WO'973 teaches a process of die casting comprising the steps of: oxidizing the Ti-Al alloy to provide a surface oxide film by heating to a temperature $\geq 800^{\circ}F$ ($\geq 427^{\circ}C$), followed by cooling in air (page 5

Application/Control Number: 09/740,708

Art Unit: 1742

lines 22-34), injecting molten aluminum into the Ti-Al shot sleeve between the Ti-Al die halves (page 7 lines 25-30), removing said die cast aluminum article and injecting additional molten aluminum, wherein said process includes cycling the Ti-Al die halves to molten aluminum temperatures (typically >600°C), and wherein said temperature is sufficient to re-form a oxide surface film (forms naturally at temperatures ≥427°C, WO'973 at page 6 lines 1-7).

WO'973 does not specify reheating to form a surface oxide (for a second cycle). However, as stated above, the temperature of molten aluminum temperatures is sufficient to reform a oxide surface film (which forms naturally at temperatures ≥427°C, WO'973 at page 6 lines 1-7). Therefore, it is held that WO'973 has created a prima facie case of obviousness of the presently claimed invention.

Concerning dependent claim 17, WO'973 teaches heating the alloy in an oxygen atmosphere prior to first contacting the Ti-Al alloy with the molten material.

Concerning claims 18-20, WO'973 does not teach the use of a Ti-Al alloy including a rare earth element in an effective amount to prolong resistance to attack of the alloy by the molten material, as presently claimed. However, as stated above, Nazmy teaches gamma phase Ti-Al alloys intended for machine components (abstract), and teaches that the addition of Yttrium provides for excellent hardness and strength at high temperatures (column 15 lines 25-54, Exemplary embodiment 54 and 56). It would have been obvious to add Yttrium to the Ti-Al alloy taught by WO'973, because Nazmy teaches that adding a rare earth metal such as Yttrium to a gamma phase Ti-Al alloy provides for excellent hardness and strength at high temperatures (column 15 lines 25-54).

Application/Control Number: 09/740,708 Page 5

Art Unit: 1742

Double Patenting

3. Claims 10-15 and 21-24 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims1-14 of U.S. Patent No. 6,283,195 B1 (hereinafter US'195) in view of Nazmy et al (US 5,286,442 A). The claims of US'195 teach a method of contacting molten aluminum with tooling (such as a mixer blade, US'195 claim 2, or a die for die casting, US'195 claim 5) made from passivated Ti-Al alloy (predominately gamma, see US'195 claim 2) with a surface oxide film (US'195 claim 1) wherein said oxide film is formed in-situ by contact at elevated temperature with an oxygen bearing atmosphere.

The claims of US'195 do not teach the use of a Ti-Al alloy including a rare earth element in an effective amount to prolong resistance to attack of the alloy by the molten material, as presently claimed. However, as stated above, Nazmy teaches gamma phase Ti-Al alloys intended for machine components (abstract), and teaches that certain alloying additions (such as Yttrium) provide for excellent hardness and strength at high temperatures (column 15 lines 25-54, Exemplary embodiment 54 and 56), enabling the field of application of the modified Ti-Al alloys to be extended to temperatures between 600-1000°C (column 14 lines 52-54). Nazmy teaches example alloy 14 (50at% Ti, 2 at%Y, 48at% Al is equivalent to 61.9wt%, 4.6wt% Y, 33.5wt% Al).

It would have been obvious to add Yttrium to the Ti-Al alloy taught by the claims of US'195, because Nazmy teaches that adding a rare earth metal such as Yttrium to a gamma phase Ti-Al alloy provides for excellent hardness and strength at high temperatures (Nazmy at column 15 lines 25-54).

4. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or

Art Unit: 1742

improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See In re Goodman, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); In re Longi, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); In re Van Ornum, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); In re Vogel, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970);and, In re Thorington, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Conclusion

5. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Janelle Combs-Morillo whose telephone number is (703) 308-4757. The examiner can normally be reached on 7:30 am- 5:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Roy King can be reached on (703) 308-1146. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 872-9310 for regular communications and (703) 873-9311 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0661.

> ROY KING SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER **TECHNOLOGY CENTER 1700**

سال

June 21, 2002